18th July, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that first Trade Commission was increased by Government and then survey was ordered to be conducted by Bhatti Committee;

(b) if so, what was the need of this survey and the authority who suggested this survey which have proved useless, and

(c) what steps have been taken by Government *to* probe the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (c) Since there was an increase in MAPE available to the industry under DPCO, 1987, its benefit without delay was passed on to the trade also by increasing the trade margins. However, the quantum of trade margin being a contentious issue. Bhatti Committee was constituted by Government to undertake a detailed and comprehensive study of the pattern of trade margins in the pharmacsnticn! industry.

Show cause notice issued by Bombay H»K'' Court against M/s. Hoechst

655. SHRIMATI BUOVA CHAKRAVARTY: Will the PRIM's- .MNISTER ' pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarres Question 373 given in the Rajya Sabha: c the 1.8th July, 1991 and s-a<c-.

(a) what was the deadline fixed'by Bore bay hig'h court for responding to show cause notices by M/s. Hoechst:

(b) whether *the* company responded :o the notices within the stipulated time, if so, the details thereof;

(c) what are the parts and dates with which the Company did not respond; and

(d) what is the reaction of Government! to the situation, with full details of date-wise communication exchanged?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): <a) to (d) M/s. Hoechst did make avafl-tmji aoroe mfriimnlion and date before the March, 1991. It was, however, noticed that the information aoopfied by the company did dot tally with the one already available with the Government and therefore, the figures needed reconciliation which is being done. The case will be progressed is accordance with the provisions of the DPCO and the directions of the Courts.

Impact of custom duty concessions on Drags

656. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred "Question 397 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th July, 1991 and state.

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have no set up to monitor the import of custom duty concessions on production and prices of end products;

(b) if so, whether Government have informed the position to the Ministry of Pinance-,

(c) If so. i\ne'; and if not, the reasons herefor?

(d) what .ue ihc names of bulk drug? >rid drug intermediates on which custom iiity concessions have been given by the •inance Ministry so far during the last wn years on the basis of re^ommenda-10ns of Government; and

(e) what are the details of other bulk drags apart from two where custom duty concessions have been passed on to public and what steps are being taken in this direction?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN) (a) to (e) Proposals of customs duty concessions are examined by this Department, before sending any recommendation in this regard *to the* Ministry of Finance, are taken into account while fixing the prices. The major objective of duty rationalisation is to encourage production from a more basic stage. The question of setting up the requisite mechanism for monitoring the production and prices of and products will be examined and taken up with Ministry of *Ttmmm.*

(d) The names of bulk drugs and drug intermediates on which customs duty concessions have been given by the Finance Ministry during the last two years are given in the custom notifications published from time to time in the official gazette copies of which are available in the library of Parliament.

Involvement of Prices of Drags in litigation cases

657. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRA VARTY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 399 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th July, 1991 and state:

(a) when the prices of formulations and bulk drugs were involved in the litigation case of M/s. Glaxo and M/s. Hoechst fixed under DPCO 1987;

(b) what was the price fixed for each and when each was implemented;

(c) what were the recommended prices of each of these from time to time afier the stay granted by the Courts initially in each case;

(d) whether it is a fact that substantial part of liability against both these companies is yet to be assessed; and

(e) if so, the details thareof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (e) The information will be collected, compiled and laid on the table of the House, as soon as possible.

Prices of Ampicillin Trihydrate and Ampicillin Anhydrous

658. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRA VARTY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 371 given in the Rajya Sabha on 18th July, 1991 and state:

(a) when the prices of formulations of Ampicillin Trihydate, Ampicillin Anhydrous were approved by Government;

(b) what is the, gap period between the said approval and 7th Januray, 1991 when *the* prices were reduced;

(c) whether Government have made a*» sessment of benefit accrued to the produe-cers on account of that lapse;

(d) whether it is a fact that this was the handy work of the concerned officers;

(e) whether Government have ordered any inquiry by an officer not concerned with the work;

(f) if so, the details thereof; and

(g) what are the basis and ground on which Government have come to the conclusion that the delay was not intentional?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (g) The orders of the then Minister were obtained on 25-7-1989 to revise the ceiling prices of formulations based ott Ampicillin Trihydrate/Anhydrous. The delay in notifying the prices was examined and it has been found to be a case of negligence by a junior official and there was no material to indicate that there was any malafide intention.

Ban on import of certain drugs

659. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have received proposals for the ban on imports of Norfloxacin, Metoprolol Tartarate, Piroxicam and Lorazepam;

(b) if so, when each proposal was re ceived and what action has been taken so far on each;

(c) what is the estimated demand of each drug and what is the total production of each drug during 1990-91; and

(d) what steps are being taken to safeguard the interest of indigenous pro ducts and what is Government Policy in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF; CHEMK^LS AND FER TJLIZJBR4 (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN: (a) No, Sir.